UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Necessary Amendments to Ex-President Hoover's European Feeding Plan - - - - - - - - - *S. O. Levinson*

Tribute to Great Britain - *Curtis W. Reese*

British Imperialism, India, and the War - - - - - - - - - *Taraknath Das*

A Lost Cause? - - - *C. Leslie Curtise*

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS

VOLUME CXXVI NUMBER 8

Chicago, December 16, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 115
Jottings—J. H. H. 117
ARTICLES—
Necessary Amendments to Ex-President Hoover's European Feeding Plan—S. O. LEVINSON 118
Tribute to Great Britain—CURTIS W. REESE 119
British Imperialism, India, and the War—TARAKNATH DAS 120
A Lost Cause?—C. LESLIE CURTISE 124
On the Pacifist Front—XXVIII 125
TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
Unholy Night—MARGARET LATHROP LAW 123
A Prayer on New Year's—LUCY REYNOLDS 123
Look Ahead!—ERNEST C. WARNER 123
War Debt—LOUISE GLOVER DAVIDSON 123
POETRY—
The Christ-Spirit—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 126
No Room—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 128
CORRESPONDENCE—
Two Letters from Dr. Pinkham—HENRY W. PINKHAM 127
National Unity—O. C. S. 127
A Letter from London—M. H. 127
THE FIELD—
Christmas Greetings from Martin Niemoeller—*Nofrontier News Service* 114
Nazi Flag Lowered—New York *Herald Tribune* 128

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Christmas Greetings from Martin Niemoeller

A Smuggled Letter

"Not you, Herr Hitler, but God is my Leader." These were the last words flung in the face of the German dictator by Martin Niemoeller, head of the Confessional Churches in Germany. Shortly thereafter began his modern martyrdom. From his place of imprisonment in the concentration camp at Sachsenhausen, Niemoeller wrote last year a Christmas letter to his followers in Germany. Smuggled out of the Reich to Switzerland, and thence by devious routes brought to America, this stirring appeal to Christians the world over, expressing so magnificently the unconquerable determination that even in darkest hours is so reassuring for the future of the world, reaches *Nofrontier News Service* in time to go out to the American public as another Christmas season draws near. Niemoeller writes:

Advent, 1939.

It is impossible for me to answer personally the many hundred greetings that have come to me at this Advent season. But there is one thing I want to ask of you all; that we give no place to weariness, to capitulation! There are those who would persuade us that the suffering of our Church is a sign that it follows a perverted way. To that we reply confidently that the Apostles have borne witness to the contrary. With certainty we know this, and on it we take our stand: As little does our welfare procure or guarantee us our peace with God as does our suffering. This peace remains the act of the grace of the One, whose suffering began in the manger and was achieved on the cross, that we might all be called the children of God. Let us believe, then, these glad tidings of God to us, and in their strength let us go forward on the way—in His footsteps—unconcerned with the censure of men, but with the peace of Christ in our hearts and with praise of God on our lips. So help us God!

It was four years ago that Pastor Niemoeller was taken from his church in Berlin-Dahlem, his papers confiscated, and he himself brought before a tribunal on charges of high treason. After eight months' detention during the investigation, the Nazi tribunal promised him that his "guilt" had been atoned for. But scarcely had he been released when he was arrested again, and without any charge being brought against him and without a trial he was imprisoned in the concentration camp at Sachsenhausen.

According to all reports reaching the outside world, Niemoeller has borne his long incarceration with exemplary patience and courage. Every ten days his wife is allowed to visit him, his five children can write to him, while his aged parents keep on trying, as they have since the first days of his imprisonment, to get him released. Several German generals, among them von Mackensen, have personally pleaded with Hitler to release Niemoeller, but Hitler's reply is always: "Niemoeller stays in the camp until he

(*Continued on page* 128)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVI MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1940 No. 8

THE RELIGION OF LOVE

"I held to the doctrine of the Sermon on the Mount with regard to 'non-resistance' and love even of enemies. I had become a Christian pacifist without any reservations. Ways must be found of showing a loving spirit even to those who were bitterly hostile to the things I held most dear and of keeping my thoughts quite clean from hate. However lacking in what the world calls 'realism' such an attitude might seem to be, I had to grasp firmly its supreme inward truth which came from God alone. It might mean suffering beyond anything I had ever known before; but in the end it would bring nearer the victory, not of my own country, or of any other country, but of the Kingdom of God and His righteousness."

CHARLES F. ANDREWS, in *The Inner Life.*

CHRISTMAS!

Yes, we believe in Christmas as much as we ever did. It is still to us the holiest of all the holidays—to be made holy by the sanctification of human hearts. The world will little heed this calendar date. The nations will go right on with the work of murder. There will be no truce—not even for a few hours of the day dedicated to "peace on earth, good will to men." We doubt if there will be even so much as the two minutes of silence and prayer which we used to keep on Armistice Day. But what is not done in the world without may be triumphantly done in the world within. That's the miracle of the spirit—that it constitutes a world which has its own laws and customs, and is impregnable to all attack. So, regardless of the world of governments and armies and navies and war and bloodshed and death, we are going to keep the Christmastide as it should be kept. We are going to set up a Christmas tree in our home, and in the glow of its happy light receive family and friends. We are going to send loving remembrances to as wide a circle as we can reach. We are going to hold a church service in which shall be spoken not one word of hate, or fear, or separation, but only love for all mankind. We are going to help the refugees of many lands to the limit of our poor ability. We are going to love all peoples everywhere—Americans, and Britons, and French, and Belgians, and Dutch, and Scandinavians, and Spaniards, and Italians, and Greeks, and Germans, and Russians, and Chinese, and Japanese, and Indians, and all others within the far bounds of humankind. We are going to pray for enemies as well as friends, and for an end to war and a speedy coming of peace. We are going to remember Jesus the Nazarene, whose birthday Christmas is supposed to be, and that he said—

"Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you."

"Ye are my disciples if ye have love for one another."

"Forgive even until seventy times seven."

"I was an-hungered, and ye gave me meat, athirst and ye gave me drink. . . ."

"Peace I give unto you."

So shall Christmas be in our hearts, and the day be holy!

"WE SHALL EMERGE, SOME DAY"!

We don't have to speculate any more as to whether the Dark Ages are coming back again. They are already here. For what were the original Dark Ages? The reversion of Europe into the darkness of cruel barbarism after centuries of Roman and Greek civilization. The order of the Empire was turned into chaos; property was destroyed, and life became uncertain; culture quite disappeared or was forgotten, and refinement with security was lost; war, murder and rapine became universal; gangster chiefs seized and held great areas of territory, and preyed upon helpless and distracted populations; violence became the order of the day, and terror the only rule of law. The church alone kept the light of learning burning, and thus lit the way to civilization's return. It is into such times as these again that we are now plunged. What is Hitler but just such a chieftain as Alaric or Attila? When since the Merovingian days have we seen such horrors as the Iron Guard executions in Roumania, preceded in 1934 by the Hitler purge? What does the new ghetto wall in Warsaw mean if not the worst phases of ancient Jewish persecutions? (See editorial following.) As for the wholesale bombings of cities and butchering of civilians, do these have any counterpart except in those dreadful conquests centuries ago when cities were besieged and captured, and whole populations put to the sword? And the hideous tortures which were the worst feature of the Dark Ages, here they are again in unnumbered concentration camps and prisons. And all around are exile, famine, and pestilence! Do we realize what we have come to? Is the church going to be able to save us, as it saved us once before? Out

of all this incredible evil is there going to come good, as the abundant medieval civilization came out of the old Dark Ages? Anne Lindbergh, in her *Wave of the Future* says, Yes—that we are being swept by a tidal flood which is preparing the way, however terribly, for a better day. Professor Walter Marshall Horton says the same in his new book on our contemporary Christianity. Five times, he declares, has religion saved society from death, and it will do so again, if only by "miracle." We believe this is true. Our hope for the future is unquenchable. But this hope is sure only as it is rooted deep in a fearless and full recognition of the desperate plight of these times.

THE GHETTO!

It has come! Not a spiritual ghetto merely, but a physical! In Warsaw, around a hundred square blocks of city houses, has been erected an eight-foot high cement wall, and behind this wall all the Jews of the city must now live. No one can pass in or out of this district without a special permit. Thus is reproduced, under Nazi rule, an institution unknown to modern times. If ever there was a dramatization of the contemporary swing back to the old barbaric past, this is it. In the same newspaper comes the story of the sinking of the passenger ship, *Patria,* in the harbor of Haifa, Palestine. This vessel, blasted by a mine or some mysterious internal explosion, was crowded with some eighteen hundred Jewish refugees, vainly seeking entrance into their ancient holy land. Accounts vary as to the original homes of these Jews, undoubtedly because they have been wandering so long and so far that their origins are lost. In episodes of this kind are we given a perfect picture of the earlier and more cruel times which we thought we had escaped forever. For ages the Jews suffered a two-fold fate. On the one hand, they were thrust behind ghetto walls, there to exist as in a prison. The badge of infamy was upon them, and they must dwell apart! On the other hand, at moments of recurring persecution, the Jews were driven from their ghettos, and took frightened flight on what Robert Nathan has called "the eternal road" of exile. With the Renaissance and the swift dawn of what we term modern times, there came in the new morning of the world's life a relaxation of the Jewish horror. When Napoleon carried the light of the French Revolution over Europe, the Jews were liberated. The ghettos were swept away, and the days of exile became a memory. In Russia (including Poland) the old hatred of the tribe still prevailed, and broke out on occasion, as in the early '80's, into hideous pogroms which turned millions of miserable Jews into refugees. But this was only a survival in a land of terror and tyranny of what Europe had now banished forever. Alas, we were the more deceived! Europe is now back a thousand years and more into the Dark Ages, with the ghetto walls going up again, and "the eternal road" once more open to traffic. And, irony of ironies, it is in Russia that the Jews are still treated honorably as human beings (though their religion, like Christianity, is under the ban of an atheistic state). The work of Jewish emancipation must be begun all over again. And we shall not be civilized until it is done.

THE PERSECUTED

> "Those who are persecuted are always the least worthy of persecution—from the prophets to the Jews and Christians and liberals of contemporary Germany. The persecuted are always the higher types and the better friends of mankind. The very fact of their persecution is the supreme witness of their worth. It has never failed to be so. Search all history. The man or group persecuted by his or its fellows and perishing on the cross or at the stake or in pogroms or in concentration camps is always necessarily the higher man or the higher group and the conscious or unconscious upholder of higher values."

This statement by Ludwig Lewisohn in his book, *The Answer,* which he calls "one of the deepest and truest paradoxes of the moral life," reminds us of a statement we once made of another angle of this same truth. Speaking of prisons and prisoners, we said that there were two classes of men who were put behind the bars. On the one hand, there were the men who could not or would not adjust themselves to society because they were ignorant, or weak, or wicked. On the other hand, there were the men who could not or would not adjust themselves to society because they were enlightened, or brave, or completely righteous. In other words, it is the worst men *and the best men* who get into trouble with governments and systems, and bear the lash of punishment. It is startling to recall in history the names of those who bear the stigma of jail—the great and good who have been imprisoned and sometimes killed as malefactors. Among those most easily remembered are Jesus, Paul, Peter, Jeremiah and many of the Hebrew prophets, Socrates, Democritus, Epictetus, Cervantes, Tasso, Savonarola, Bruno, Sir Thomas More, George Fox, John Bunyan, William Penn, Thomas Paine, Henry David Thoreau, John Brown, Eugene V. Debs, and in our own day, Gandhi, Kagawa, and Niemoeller. In referring to the persecuted, as contrasted with the punished, Mr. Lewisohn presents a still clearer case of paradox, for the persecuted, as he points out, are invariably the best, and not merely the best and the worst. This is a topsy-turvy world, dear brethren. The values of the hour are seldom the values of eternity, and the strong are seldom justified.

THE MIRACLE OF ENGLAND

It *is* a miracle. And not merely in the field of national defense on the field of battle! We are thinking at this moment rather of the miracle of a democracy still functioning freely under the pressure of a war to the death. Take the matter of non-registrants under the military conscription law! One would think that it would be England that would be excited and severe in the treatment of men who not only refuse to fight, but refuse even to recognize and obey a law to raise an army, whereas America, not at war and in no danger,

would be comparatively mild and indifferent. But it is just the other way around! Our non-registrants under the draft law we are branding as felons, with forfeiture of all citizenship rights, under prison sentences of a year and a day or a year and six months, while England has established in these cases a uniform fine of five pounds, with no imprisonment at all. Then there is the matter of printing! Our heart still skips a beat as we read the papers which come to us from England—an opposition labor paper, an anarchist journal, several pacifist magazines. These papers vary in content and tone—the pacifist magazines contain no such furious denunciation of the government and the war as the more politically-minded papers. But they all oppose the war and plead for peace—and the government does not interfere! In these papers we read announcements of anti-war meetings and pacifist conferences, which are held apparently as freely as in pre-war days. Here is a pacifist in Northampton who announces his candidacy for Parliament on a "Stop the War" platform—and we surmise his name will go on the ballot. And all the while Parliament is in session, under the rain of German bombs, and "His Majesty's Opposition" still sits in opposition, and free debate on war issues goes on. We count all this a miracle—and to the everlasting glory of England. Would we Americans do the same? Not if our last war experience is any criterion. And England herself, it must regretfully be noted, does not always do the same outside the British Isles. In India, for example, where the people live under an iron rule of repression and cruelty! If democracy works so bravely at home, why not there also?

WHEN THE BIBLE IS NEWS!

The Bible, for some curious reason, is headline news whenever anything utterly inconsequential comes along about the Scriptures. Thus, not long ago, in these days of world-shaking events, all the newspapers found room for the story that some Biblical researcher somewhere had discovered that Methuselah, the son of Enoch, had lived not 969 years, as *Genesis* has it, but a total of only 192 years. This, according to our journalistic friends, is news on a day when Hitler is bombing London, Frenchmen are facing starvation, and Americans are adopting universal peacetime military conscription. *News!* Why? Is Methuselah a figure of any importance in the history of mankind? The Bible devotes only five verses to him; and these verses simply tell who his father was, how long his father lived after he was begotten, how old he was when he begat his son, Lamech, how many years he lived after this act of conception, and the final momentous fact that "he died." Methuselah's achievements, in other words, were three in number: he was begotten, he begat, and, after a long term of years, he died. And what difference does it make whether he died after 969 or after only 192 years? The former figure is only more improbable than the latter. In either case we are dealing not with fact but with fable. Yet this is "news"! Why not "news" of another description? Why not discover not that Methuselah was not as old as we thought he was, but that Jeremiah was not as "patriotic" as we imagined—that he was a pacifist who asked his people, when they were fighting against a conqueror, "why will ye die by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence," when you can and ought to make peace? How about Jesus and his declaration, "Resist not evil"? That ought to get front-page space in any American newspaper! Then there is Paul, and his injunction to the Christians in Rome that "if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink." If it is the surprising, the sensational, the new and strange, that newspapers are always looking for, here it is in passages like these. Why bother with infinitesimally unimportant items about insignificant Bible characters, and neglect these momentous items that scream from a hundred pages of scripture. Talk about "scoops"! Here they are for any editor who wants a real piece of news about the Bible.

Jottings

Now that this nation has duly celebrated two Thanksgivings for a second successive year, is it quite impossible for President and Governors to get together and end this absurdity? Apart from the inconvenience, it would really seem as though there were hardly enough to be thankful for in this world to justify a double holiday.

In lieu of other blessings, we may well give thanks perhaps that there is only one Christmas. Families separated on the turkey day may rejoice the more that they are together on the holly and mistletoe day.

Multitudinous books are now being written and published to tell us why France fell. It is all so plain! The facts were so obvious! But why did nobody see and report them before the disaster? Was this a conspiracy of silence, or is it just one more case of hindsight being so much better than foresight?

The late Lord Tweedsmuir was a prolific author under his own name of John Buchan. During his lifetime he published fifty-two books; in 1932 he published no less than five volumes; now, after his death, we

have his autobiography *Pilgrim's Way*. This is a record comparable to that of his immortal compatriot, Sir Walter Scott, whom he memorialized in a brilliant biography.

A certain swing composer of the day has written a song to a melody by Tschaikowsky, and he announces the song as "written by Tschaikowsky, assisted by (himself)." Imagine the unmitigated gall of a tin-pan alley songster *assisting* Tschaikowsky!

If Italian sailors fight at sea the way Italian soldiers fight on land, we need have no doubt of the accuracy of the British reports of highly successful engagements with Mussolini's navy.

J. H. H.

Necessary Amendments to Ex-President Hoover's European Feeding Plan*

S. O. LEVINSON

1. I think it will be generally agreed that Mr. Hoover is almost, if not altogether, in a class by himself as the man for such a humanitarian undertaking, both by reason of his nature and his wide experience.

2. The basic objection to the outline of his plan as he has published it is that Nazi Germany is not required to make any, at least, affirmative concessions. From an American point of view the Nazis caused this calamitous situation, and it would be scarcely short of absurd not to attach as a condition to our aid workable concessions by Germany.

3. The overwhelming majority of the American people will not accept the bare word of Chancellor Hitler because he has broken treaties, pledges, and solemn assurances time and again whenever he has deemed it to be in the Nazi interest. It is true there are one or probably two negative contributions required of Germany in Mr. Hoover's plan. One is that the Nazis restore all the food that they have appropriated, taken away, stored, or consumed. Here is an almost impossible undertaking. There would be a sharp issue raised by Germany on the theory that she did not take any foodstuffs. Even if she admitted that she did, there would be almost an interminable squabble to ascertain how much she took and what has become of it. Indefinite time would be required to thrash out such questions. In the meantime the people could perish so far as these appropriated foodstuffs are concerned.

The other so-called concession is an agreement on the part of Germany that she will not take any of the food that comes to these conquered peoples by reason of the release of the British blockade. In this connection it is well to remember that the Nazi Government announced when this subject was first broached, that she would coöperate in this matter but that "naturally it would be with reference to the food after the German army and people had been reasonably satisfied." What with wholly unreliable promises and with the most litigious attitude toward the whole question always argued favorably for the German people and her soldiery, this concession amounts to so little that it would be utterly repudiated and rejected by the United States.

4. Unless Germany attempts to evade the responsibility for these conquests by taking the position that she was merely protecting her own country from the seizure of these European States by England as bases for attacks on Germany, the guilt of these aggressions and conquests is clearly and solely on her shoulders. In order to answer her claimed defense it is suggested that in the Hoover Plan there be inserted a clause that would fully protect Germany and all other nations against the use of these recently conquered states for spheres of military activity.

5. For it is the essence of these proposed amendments or additions to the Hoover Plan that Germany must agree (if England releases the blockade and the government and people of the United States alone or in connection with other governments and peoples furnish the necessary food, whether paid for or not) to withdraw from all control and subjugation of these states and return national power and sovereignty to these various countries. Thus if Germany wants America to aid the starving people of some but not all of her newly occupied States, she must first, or at the same time, carry out the withdrawals. The agreements to feed would become operative only as to those States from which she makes effective withdrawal.

6. That Germany ought to make such a concession, with the protective condition against use as bases or attacks as above suggested, appeals to all sense of reason. For if Hitler is ambitious to be the master of all these European countries, he certainly will not want his subjects to starve by the million. Unless Germany has that much interest in the lives and welfare of her enlarged population, it would be an open confession of guilt beyond any in recorded history. Unless we can utilize humanitarianism for the benefit of civilization, present and future, we are only falling into a new type of "appeasement." Suppose, for example, that the Axis conquers Greece, are we also to feed the Greek population under the Hoover Plan? Suppose further that Turkey enters the war, as seems likely, would we not be obligated under the Hoover Plan to feed the millions of Turks in case of defeat? I was somewhat startled one night recently when Mr. Hoover, broadcasting from Poughkeepsie, stated that he had withdrawn from the operation of his plan the distressed people of France "because of political complications." I cannot follow this type of reasoning in terms of humanitarianism. Our heartstrings are all pulled and set agog by the sufferings in Europe but we must keep our emotions, to some extent, under the control of our minds and judgment. And what about the suffering people, and especially the children, of China involving tens of millions? Where do we draw the line, and will we be able to do it, and to what definitive end? Unless

*These suggested amendments to the Hoover Plan are especially significant, coming as they do from the man whom M. Briand himself, upon first meeting Mr. Levinson, greeted as the real father of the Pact of Paris. Lord Lothian's announcement, made since this article went to press, that Great Britain cannot accede to the terms of the Hoover Plan shows the soundness of Mr. Levinson's position that a more realistic approach to the problem is gravely needed.—*Managing Editor.*

we can preserve civilization and improve it, as we used to think we could, these emotional outbursts, worthy of all praise in themselves, may turn to ashes. Indeed it is not too much to say that the indirect, and probably direct, aid that would accrue to Germany through this assistance of her victims of might would even be an incentive to aggressions and conquests. It would put a premium on international ravage and spoliation; it would please a ruthless "superman" who defies God and deifies force. There has already been entirely too much "appeasement" and thereby of encouragement of the aggressor nations. For it is the same Nazi Germany that half won our sympathies by her cry of being a "have-not" nation that has by brute force already become one of the greatest "have" nations.

7. As it is now the overwhelming sentiment of the American people that we should do all in our power to furnish aid and assistance to Great Britain in her heroic and unexcelled struggle, almost alone, to prevent the destruction of liberty, religion, and civilization itself, we should be absolutely sure that we are doing nothing to injure Great Britain in her defense in which the blockade plays so great a part. And above all, we must get some humane concessions from the enemies of liberty, religion, and civilization before we ask Britain to abandon any important aspect of her vital defense.

8. Germany will thus be given the opportunity to prove her claimed desire to aid and protect European peoples and of striving for a peace worthy of the name. Indeed she should be the foremost in efforts and sacrifices to avoid hunger, sickness, disease, epidemics, and deaths among the European peoples in whose welfare and improvement she now claims to be so interested as to form a new governmental and economic order.

9. It is unheard of in history for one nation coldbloodedly to conquer another and expect or request a third country to feed the despoiled population of the conquered country. The question of the food being paid for is not a humanitarian one, and, besides, the money offered is frozen in America and its release would be a triumph for Hitler, unless he also makes valuable contributions to the great cause.

10. Nazi Germany, it has been said, would refuse to comply with the amended conditions above incorporated. Of course we would insist upon the publication of the proposal in all the prominent newspapers of the Third Reich so that the German people would be informed. Then if Hitler refused to make any of these substantial concessions, it would be a show-down of inestimable value for world public opinion. If he accepted in substantial part, it might lead the way to better things, even to the structure of world peace.

Tribute to Great Britain*

CURTIS W. REESE

All who love liberty should and will honor Great Britain for the courage, the vigor, and the tenacity with which she continues to resist the onslaught of Nazi and Fascist aggression. Her superb marshalling of the great reserves of British stamina is of epic proportions and will remain forever a classic chapter in the history of democracy.

While I am fully aware that Britain is our own first line of defense, that the British Navy floats between us and the gravest dangers, and that the fortunes of democracy throughout the world are involved in the outcome of Britain's titanic struggle, it is not with these things—important as they are—that I am primarily concerned. The matter that is now of major and pressing importance is that Great Britain shall survive in her life-and-death struggle for her very existence. The colossal struggle that Great Britain is making against terrifying odds, without regard to the content of the social and political issues involved, commands the admiration and stirs the imagination of free men everywhere. When to this is added the values that are at stake in terms of human personality, of the institutions of freedom, and of the possibilities of democratic progress, we owe an obligation to Great Britain that can never be fully realized and that can never be fully paid.

The least that we of America can and should do, not merely for our own protection but for the existence of Britain, is to move with dispatch in the following ways:

1. Let us abandon the pretense of neutrality. We are not neutral in the face of the effort of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy to enslave the continent of Europe and to tighten their grip about the throat of mankind. In the recent presidential campaign both major party candidates left no room for doubt on this matter, and many acts of our government supported by overwhelming public sentiment reassure us that America is still young for liberty. We are not neutral and no technicalities can make us appear as such. Let the pretense be frankly abandoned.

2. We should immediately revise the barriers having to do with credits, with cash and carry, with precedence of orders, and the like, that now stand in the way of the speedy production and delivery of the materiel and the food that must be immediately available if utter doom is not to settle down upon the British Isle. Not thousands but tens of thousands of aircraft, not tons but mountains of materiel must be made available at the earliest possible moment. Speed in these matters is important, else there will be no Britain to defend.

3. We must make sure that our sympathies are not vitiated and material help delayed by considerations and arguments not pertinent to the immediate situation. We must not allow discussion of causes leading to the war—causes of which we are painfully aware; nor talk of the waves of the future—of which we know only too little; nor clamor for the terms of the future peace—important as these are; nor the call for appeasement, nor the theories of an impossible isolationism deafen us to the immediate and pressing call for the assistance in terms of equipment that will assure a final British victory.

In these and other ways, more than by words however true, can we show how great is our admiration for Britain, how genuinely we believe in her cause, and how sincerely we are willing to strive for her triumph, with its accompanying restoration of sanity to a stricken continent, of peace to a distraught world, and of hope to mankind.

*Abstract of address delivered at K. A. M. Temple, Chicago, November 14, 1940.

British Imperialism, India, and the War

TARAKNATH DAS

Nearly a year ago, Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, former Mayor of Calcutta, and ex-President of the Indian National Congress, and several hundred Indian nationalists were sent to prison for opposing India's entry into the present World War. Only recently it was reported that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, former President of the Indian National Congress, had been arrested and sentenced to four years' imprisonment. Today thousands of Indian nationalists are in prison on the charge of violating "Defense Regulation 39 B which lays down that no person shall endeavor, whether orally or otherwise, to influence public opinion in a manner likely to be prejudicial to defense of the realm or the efficient prosecution of war." Mr. Stanley Unwin, writing in the *Times* (London) October 31, 1939, pointed out that this regulation "could be used to stifle almost any criticism of any governmental action in wartime or even the discussion of war aims." It is apparent that Mr. Unwin's conclusion has proved to be an actuality in India today. None should be surprised if Mr. Gandhi be forced to adopt active non-coöperation against the British Government in India.

The British authorities are telling the world, especially the American public, that they are fighting for World Freedom and against Nazi tyranny. The American public has decided to make Britain's fight its own. Under these circumstances, it will be wise for the American public to carefully consider Britain's attitude toward the Indian demand for freedom, as expressed in *Where Do We Go from Here?* by Harold J. Laski, (copyrighted 1940 by Harold J. Laski, and here used by permission of The Viking Press, Inc., New York).

> *We fight to preserve democracy and freedom. We have, therefore, to conquer in our own society those inherent tendencies of privilege to deny to democracy and freedom any power to expand which threatens its vested interests.* We have to conquer them, as I have argued, as the very condition of the victory we seek. I do not say we shall conquer them. I only say that, *if we should will to do so, we have the power and that, without that will, a fate akin to that of France is certain to be ours.* History could have given us no ampler warning of the nature of the choice we confront.
>
> But the preservation of democracy and freedom is not, of course, a matter which concerns ourselves alone. As the condition of their safety we have to effect the defeat of the outlaws wherever they have raised their head. Our war is not a struggle of which we can ignore the interconnexions. We who have seen how Japanese success in Manchuria can lead to Italian conquests in Africa and how the German conquest of France may profoundly affect the balance of power in the Far East can see at once that *this is an international civil war in which we are engaged. The cleansing of our democracy, this is to say, is a matter of international consequence.* We make our aims in this struggle known at least as much by what we do as by what we say. Our friends, not less our enemies, deduce our motives as much from the policy for which we are responsible as from the explanations we issue of its meaning. The enemies of the outlaws should not need to be taught that words are counters, when they are separated from the appropriate deed, with which to twist and corrupt the hearts of men.
>
> This has an obvious bearing upon two phases of our international policy. It influences, first, our position as an empire and the impact of its internal relations upon the outside world, and it influences, secondly, our authority to persuade the peoples of the European Continent, not least the people of Germany, that we genuinely seek a world peace which definitely rules out the possibility of resuming war. I must now analyze the implications of each of these phases.
>
> The first is a complicated one, because the relations of empire are complicated. It touches not only trade and population and access to raw materials, and the important but too neglected opportunity afforded by empire to offer the opportunities of a successful career to several thousands of young men each year; it touches, I may add, each of these more profoundly as, with the decline of capitalist expansion, we are tempted, as at Ottawa, to restrict access to the fruits of empire to less favoured powers. This is part of the general problem of the contradiction between political relations and economic forces which is set up by the collapse of the economic foundations of our civilization.
>
> I select out of this complexity one illustration of the problem of empire, and that the most pivotal of all: India. We have an immense stake in India; without the immense wealth its possession has brought us we should not have been able to meet, at least peacefully meet, the demands of the proletariat in this country. We have, I do not doubt, done much for India that is for its benefit; above all, I think, we have brought it to consciousness of its destiny as a nation. India stands before us today demanding the right to self-government as clearly as ever America or Ireland did, demanding freedom from our paramount power as unmistakably as Poland or Czechoslovakia demands freedom from the paramount power of Germany over them. There is not one popular leader in India, with a serious following behind him, to whom we can appeal for support of the continuance of our paramountcy. Year by year, to maintain it, even in the revised form of 1936, we have to resort to special powers, the exercise of undemocratic authority, the wide use of the power to imprison and to flog. The few Indians of position we can produce to applaud our rule are men whom we have elevated for that purpose, who, without that elevation, as both we and India know, would be against us and not for us. The main interest we support in India, apart from our own financial interest, is a mass of feudal princes of whom, with not more than six exceptions, it can, so far as the last half-century is concerned, be said with literal accuracy that the character of their governance competes, in barbarism and squalor, with that of the outlaws in Europe.
>
> The character of our rule in India, maintained in defiance of Indian demands, has all over the world long stained our reputation for plain dealing; until the advent of Hitler and Mussolini, it was the classic example of imperialist exploitation. We are squarely faced from India with a demand, insistently maintained, for self-government, and we know within ourselves that sooner or later we must yield to it, even though the risk to our interests of so yielding is a formidable one. But we cling to the maintenance of that interest by every pretext and device we can discover. The very statesmen who manipulate these pretexts and devices are most prolific in the announcement of their yearning for the fulfillment of India's ambition; Sir Samuel Hoare was even shameless enough to represent the Act of 1935, which ingeniously multiplied every protective device discoverable of reaction, as a long step on the road to that fulfillment. We announce that we shall put no obstacle in the way of Indian freedom; we ask only that all Indians of every sort shall first agree upon its pattern. And since that agreement is not forthcoming, we continue to govern India for our own purposes. Meanwhile, in the name of the Indian people, we ourselves take this and that decision on its behalf and then proudly thank India for its generosity to us, or we accept this gift or that from one or other of the Indian princes—their method of insuring their further protection from us—which we know is a gift mostly wrung from the misery of their unhappy subjects, and then exhibit these gifts as the proof of Indian "loyalty." I do not know how far we deceive ourselves by this technique; empire possesses a large capacity for self-deception. I do know that we deceive no people beyond the boundaries of our empire—least of all the Indian people themselves.
>
> It seems to me clear that the solution of the Indian problem—which is not a simple one on any showing—depends upon the reality of our determination to agree to its self-government. If we said, for example, that this self-government will begin to operate within a year of the conclusion

of peace; if we proposed to India a constituent assembly elected from the present provincial assemblies and announced, subject to suitable negotiations with ourselves, that we should ask Parliament to ratify the conclusions it reached; if we built a National Government of Indians at Delhi to conduct the war and the negotiations with us; if we suggested that such communal differences as the assembly failed to solve should be submitted to independent arbitration, to the Permanent International Court, for instance, or to the President of the United States; I do not think an appropriate pattern of Indian freedom would be long in forthcoming. *But so long as every vested interest in India is, like the Moslem interest, encouraged, openly or secretly, to believe that it will get better terms from dependence upon us than from a real attempt at accommodation with other Indian interests, of course agreement between them is not forthcoming.* We patronize these dissidents from unity in the same way, though much more subtly, as the Conservative Party has so long patronized the separation of Ulster, and with the same evil consequences.

For the gains that would be available to us from a free India, bound to us, like the Dominions, by no ties other than its own choice, would be immense from any point of view. It is not only, as we have been made aware, that such an India, even in the stage of its approach to freedom, would give us a wealth of aid in the war effort that we cannot dare, under present conditions, to exact from her. It is not only that such an India would free us from necessities of coercion which, when they issue in events like Amritsar, bedevil our domestic politics. It is not only, further, that a free India could begin that fuller exploitation of its own resources which its present service to our vested interests at so many points restricts and constrains. It is also that, freezing India now, we remove from the post-war years a problem that will, because it will grow in intensity, hamper by the attention for which it will call our capacity to deal with our own immense issues of reconstruction. *It is, above all, because the recognition by us of India's right to freedom is the supreme announcement we can make to the world that we have done, once and for all, with the older imperialism.*

I do not think it is possible to exaggerate the importance of such an announcement, not least in its influence upon the subject peoples of Germany and Italy in whom we are so greatly concerned both to arouse and to sustain hope. We cannot easily exaggerate its beneficent influence upon the Soviet Union or upon liberal opinion in the United States. But every day that we postpone its coming, we diminish the importance it will have. I take this view upon the ground that no policy is more unwise than that which concedes in a period of difficulty a demand which should justly be conceded in a period of ease. The case against that unwisdom was stated, in terms no one can better, by Macaulay nearly a century ago in the very analogous issue of Ireland. "You will make it," he told the House of Commons about the concession of a grant to Maynooth, "as every concession to Ireland has been made. You will make it when its effect will be, not to appease, but to stimulate agitation. You will make it when it will be regarded not as a great act of national justice, but as a confession of national weakness. You will make it in such a way, and at such a time, that there will be but too much reason to doubt whether more mischief has been done by your long refusal, or by your tardy and enforced compliance."

The point I am making is the simple one that empire is a handicap to freedom whenever its subjects deny the validity of its maintenance. At that stage it must either become a partnership or degenerate into a tyranny. And it is particularly dangerous to permit that degeneration when it offers to our enemies an opportunity of reproach to which we have no adequate response. The plea made by our enemies that the real nature of our dominion is shown by the way in which we maintain our rule in India we cannot answer by reference to a single Indian representative able freely to secure the full support of his own people. We can answer that plea only by saying that we are satisfied with our achievement there. But we have, in truth, no more right to constitute ourselves judges in our own cause than the Fascist leaders possess; less even, since we deny them that right so soon as its attempted application touches ourselves. *A nation can justly stand as trustee of another people when it can be shown that no vested interest of its own is safeguarded by that trusteeship, and when a detached observer would admit, first, that the people so ruled do not claim freedom from trusteeship and, second, when the objective results of its exercise are clearly and mainly for the benefit of that people. Judged by these standards, it is clear, I think, that the sooner we end our paramountcy over India the better for Indians and for ourselves.* And there is no moment more fitting to end it than in a war where we declare ourselves to be the world defenders of democracy and freedom. In the long run, it is evident, the interests we maintain by its suppression abroad are interests whose claims we shall regard as paramount also at home. In the infection that attitude compels there lies the grave danger that we shall destroy the end it is our ambition to serve.

When one gives up wishful thinking and faces the realities of world politics today, it becomes increasingly evident that the British Empire cannot expect any effective support from any quarter except the United States of America. At the same time, America's pro-British foreign policy has created a situation in which the United States has no other friend than the British Empire. From this point of view, it is clear that the Anglo-American Powers are united, because they are faced with a common danger. It is undoubtedly the foreign policy of the United States, in spite of all bickerings of party politics, that the United States must support Britain as if the Anglo-American Powers were in an offensive and defensive alliance.

The Axis Powers have very successfully been pursuing a policy of isolating the Anglo-American Powers in world politics; and this fact has been one of the prime factors in winning victories. To be concrete, before the present World War began, the Anglo-French Allies tried to come to an understanding with Soviet Russia, in which they utterly failed. The Anglo-French Powers gave guaranties to Poland, Rumania, Turkey, and Greece, so that these powers would act as virtual allies against the Axis Powers. The Anglo-French Powers tried, without making any concessions, to keep Italy, Spain, and Japan from entering the war in favor of Nazi Germany. But what is the result? Germany has not only conquered Poland and France, but she has secured control over all the Scandinavian countries, Holland, and Belgium. In the Balkans, Rumania and Hungary are under German control; while Yugoslavia and Bulgaria are ready to join the Axis Powers. And now Greece is the object of Nazi aggression. Furthermore, it is staggering to think that vanquished France will in all probability allow the Axis Powers to use the French bases in France and in her colonies against Great Britain; and it is not improbable that Spain will make a common cause with the Axis Powers and make such concessions as will be detrimental to the safety of the British Empire.

In the Near East, Turkey is willing to coöperate with Great Britain, although since the collapse of France she is not bound to fight for Britain. Furthermore, Turkey may not agree to endanger her very existence by taking a stand against the Axis Powers, unless she is sure that Russia would support her. But there is every reason to believe that Soviet Russia will not only avoid any conflict with Germany, but that she will join the German-Italian-Japanese combination against Great Britain and her only ally—the United States.

The United States Government, in perfect agreement with Great Britain, has decided to support the China of General Chiang Kai-shek against Japan. The Japanese on the other hand have decided to check Anglo-American-Chinese assault on her by adopting several effective steps, such as: (a) A non-aggression pact with Soviet Russia, which will free Japan from any fear of Russian attack, (in this matter Germany is using full pressure on Soviet Russia to support Japan); (b) establishment of herself in Indo-China in such a fashion that she will be able to use Indo-China

bases against China and other powers in all emergencies; (c) establishment of close relation with Thai-land (Siam) as a virtual ally, and encouragement of the Government of Thai-land to attack Indo-China to recover some of the Siamese territories which were annexed by France some time ago; (d) readiness to come to an agreement with Wang Ching-wei and recognize his government. In short, to combat the Anglo-American-Chinese combination against Japan, the Japanese are working to perfect Russo-Japanese-Siamese understanding, to be supported by a so-called Chinese puppet government and Indo-China, and, if necessary, attack Britain at Singapore.

The crisis in the Far East will come to a head in the form of war between Japan and her allies on the one hand, and the Anglo-American Powers and China on the other, provided the Anglo-American Powers feel strong enough to force the issue with Japan by practicing total embargo and inducing the government of the Dutch Indies to refuse to supply oil and other raw materials to Japan. So long as Britain is faced with the battles of Britain, the Mediterranean, Africa, the Near East, and the Middle East, it is not conceivable that the Anglo-American Powers will try to force the issue with Japan. Furthermore, if Japan succeeds in securing full support of Siam and makes an agreement with Soviet Russia, the Anglo-American Powers may not be too anxious to force the issue.

If Soviet Russia agrees to join the German-Italian-Japanese Alliance, then it is quite conceivable that Soviet Russia, instead of helping Turkey—an ally of Britain—will be willing to annex the Turkish territory of Kars and also a portion of northern Persia, as compensation in the Near East, and the Chinese province of Sinkiang in the Far East.

In short, there is every indication that the Anglo-American Powers will have to meet the combined forces of Germany, Italy, Japan, Siam, and effective support from France, Spain, Russia, and even China. In such a crisis, India and Burma—which was until very recently a part of India—will become the most vital factor, if not the determining factor.

The British Government, determined to keep India under subjection, so far has not been willing to make such concessions to the Indian Nationalists as will lead to a virtual Indo-British alliance, and to the Indian Nationalists fighting for Britain or the Anglo-American Powers defending with zeal their own liberty. At the same time, Germany, Italy, Soviet Russia, and Japan are fully aware of the fact that if the Anglo-American Powers fail to utilize the man power of India, which is 350,000,000, they will be able to defeat Britain in the Near East and even in the Far East. The best way to cripple the Anglo-American Powers in the Far East and the Near East is to create internal chaos, revolution, and open outbreak against Britain in Burma and India. It may be emphasized that if the present conflict continues for some time, then Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan will try their best to foment revolution in Burma and India, in the same manner as Great Britain supported the Arab Revolt, to break up the Ottoman Empire and to cripple the Central Powers in the World War of 1914-1918.

In this connection, it may be mentioned that during the World War of 1914-1918, Germany, aided by Turkey, tried to stir up revolution in India. But this did not succeed, because at that time the Indian Nationalist movement had not attained its maturity.

Its leaders—M. Gandhi and others—were supporting the British, and the minority of the Indian revolutionists were easily crushed, because neither Germany nor Turkey could supply arms to Indians in the same manner as Colonel Lawrence and others could support Emir Feisal and his followers. But if Germany, Italy, and Russia march into the Near East and the Middle East, and Japan, supported by Siam, marches into Burma, then Indian revolutionists might be encouraged by the prospects of actual military support from outside; and anti-British Indian Nationalists—at least some of them—may decide to make a common cause with the enemies of the Anglo-American Powers.

There is no doubt that there are millions of Indian Nationalists who are opposed to British imperialism, but they are more fearful of possible oppression by Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan, if the Anglo-American Powers should be defeated. These Nationalists are willing to coöperate with the Anglo-American Powers, provided they at least receive the same consideration which has been extended to Turkey, which cannot even defend herself from a Russian attack without support from India.

But as things stand today, the Indian people—and particularly Indian Nationalist leaders—will have to make a decision. They cannot remain neutral; and India is at war. To me it is clear, not primarily on the ideological basis of anti-imperialism or anti-Fascism, but on the basis of preserving India's own national interest, that Indian Nationalist leaders have only one course to follow: they must be engaged in the preparation of total defense of India from any foreign attack. India must take active part, by every possible means, to defend her frontiers.

Where are the frontiers of India which should be defended by the Indian people in alliance with friendly powers? To understand my point of view regarding Indian frontiers, one should think of American frontiers in the present crisis for an analogy. In the north, American frontiers are in Greenland; in the Atlantic, the British Isles and the British Navy are the ramparts of American defense; in the south, the extremity of the American defense frontier extends to the whole of the Western Hemisphere—to Cape Horn; and in the Pacific, the American defense frontier is not in the Philippines, but in Chungking, Singapore, Dutch East Indies, and Australia. Similarly, the Indian defense frontier in the west lies on the Mediterranean shores: in Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Turkey, Arabia, Persia to the geographical frontiers of western India; in the north, India's defense frontier lies in Afghanistan, Chinese Turkestan or Sinkiang, Tibet, and neighboring regions; in the east, India's defense frontier lies in the regions between Singapore, Siam, and Burma; and the southern defense of India depends upon the sea power which will remain supreme in the regions of the south-western Pacific, the Indian Ocean bordering the eastern coasts of the African continent.

For a Nationalist India, the supreme issue is to acquire India's freedom and to defend it from external enemies and internal troubles. It is not conceivable that India can acquire her freedom through the grace of Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan; nor will the British imperialists concede her demands for freedom without a struggle or pressure. India will have to work to force the British, through the support of the United States, so that India's man power and resources will be used fully to develop all means for total defense of India, and at the same time support the cause of the Anglo-American Powers.

If the Anglo-American Powers refuse to treat nationalist India as their ally, and refuse to help India at least in the same fashion as America is helping nationalist China, then in spite of India's willingness to defend herself, she will not be able to do so and at the same time the Anglo-American Powers will deprive themselves of the most potent weapon of Indian support in the Near East, the Middle East, and the Far East.

It seems that British statesmanship has become barren and short-sighted. It has so far failed to win over powerful nations like Japan, Italy, Spain, and Russia on its side, because they were not willing to make concessions. In this world you cannot secure support of a power without giving something in return; even the British, to get American support of fifty destroyers and ammunition supply, have agreed to lease bases to the United States. There are American statesmen who are willing to pursue a policy of Anglo-American-Chinese alliance; are they willing to extend the sphere of this alliance to India?

It seems that Anglo-American statesmen, for some peculiar reasons, are not willing to recognize the immediate necessity of an Anglo-American-Indian Alliance for the defense of the Near East, the Middle East, and the Far East. They seem to have forgotten the great part played by India during the World War of 1914-1918, when more than a million and a quarter Indian soldiers fought on the battlefronts in France, Gallipoli, Egypt, South Africa, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Singapore, Tsingtao, et cetera, when India contributed billions of dollars, supplied millions of tons of food, raw materials and vast quantities of ammunition to win the victory for the British Empire.

It is a fact that militarily, economically, as well as strategically, India's position is of vaster importance than that of China. It may be safely asserted that without the full coöperation of India, the Anglo-American Powers cannot and will not be able to hold their own against the combined forces of Germany, Italy, Russia, Japan, and their allies and dependencies.

For Indian Nationalists there is only one course—concentration of all energies for perfecting measures for total defense by forming an Anglo-American-Indian Alliance. If they fail in their efforts, then the Anglo-American Powers will not be able to hold their own in Asia, and India will fall a victim of the Axis Powers.

May Heaven forbid that, due to lack of foresight on the part of Anglo-American statesmen and Indian Nationalist leaders, India may be an active or indirect supporter of Nazi Germany and her allies!

Trumpets on New Horizons

Unholy Night

Carolling lusty hymns of hate
The enemy armies decorate
The lovely curving hills of earth,
In homage to our Savior's birth
With festoons of trench and armoured wall.
Our sacred Christmas "midnight still"
Is given to bombers' murder-shrill.
The heaven lighted by a guiding star
Is jagged with raiders' horror scar.
Who can worship a vaunted "Prince of Peace"
Till our madman's holocaust shall cease?

MARGARET LATHROP LAW.

Look Ahead!

(A Song for the New Year)

Swell your throat, and sound out your song;
Let the dull world know you are strong!
Fare on, outstripping the laggard few—
Many will listen and march with you.

All through life some travel alone,
Sensing only the ring-dove's moan.
Lift up your hearts with the mockingbird;
Let the call of your strength be heard.
Awaken your heavy limbs—and go free—
The best of all life is yet to be!

ERNEST C. WARNER.

A Prayer on New Year's

Romance: Oh, keep the youth light in our eyes,
Give dreams that lift like wings upon our feet;
For in our keep and care today there lies
A world where builders and destroyers meet,
A world where death takes hold, or life begins.
Love: Love, by whom we came from slime to soul,
From beast-cry to the voice of violins—
Conceive and sculpture being, quick and whole,
In trysts of freedom and of high desire,
The children of a happiness to be.
Stark Pride: grant us the strength of seas, and fire
To melt our chains; light us with flares to see
The blasphemy of want—with joy lay bare
The riches and the beauty, *in our care!*

LUCY REYNOLDS.

War Debt

Upon the earth I hear a song of hate,
Accompanied by guns in strident chord,
And land is fouled with blood in grim reward
To earth whose thirstiness they desecrate.
The soil is disregarded as they prate
Of guns' efficiency, of airplane hoard,
And land so ripe for ploughing is a sward
Which men are too engrossed to cultivate.

But earth which offered curvesome body once,
Retaliates at last for being spurned,
Its richness garroted in weedy threat,
It pays in barrenness for these affronts,
Starvation is the final harvest earned,
And war collects in full its awful debt.

LOUISE GLOVER DAVIDSON.

A Lost Cause?

C. LESLIE CURTISE

Two things stand out with obvious clarity in the present national and social issue of conscription: first, the complete surrender of the Church; and secondly, the consequent confusion of her ministers. Such a situation would be fascinating to the interested observer, were it not so utterly tragic.

Few, if any church leaders, realize to what extent the Church as an organized institution has passed the crossroads. The experience of the World War should have been convincing enough that another repetition would be utterly fatal to the Church. But perhaps there is no answer to an apparently hopeless situation.

Think of the confused and bewildered layman. Before the World War he was taught by the Church to hate and despise every instrument which led to war. During the war he was dragooned, mucilaged into a point of view where war was an institution blessed by the blessed Christ. After the war he was baptized in a fresh fire of revulsion for everything that had to do with the abominable pit of disillusionment. We would not suffer again! Never again would we be so deceived, so misled, so obviously at odds with ourselves. It was the end—the finish. The outstanding preacher-chaplain of America professed in vehement terms that he was done with war, and with penitent words of clairvoyance he exhorted his soul to heights of conscientious renewal.

Well and good! Not an individual but what responded. It was the mood of the moment. Noble resolutions were passed by peace-minded delegations. Oratorical words were spoken with a convincing fervor. We were resolved once and for all to banish the idea of war and its instruments. We were in a humble mood, and we expressed ourselves in corresponding terms. Once again we were a united people in our determination to be free from the horrors of war.

But incidents evoke the emotional convictions of men. Or are we men? In the political world we raise a hullabaloo over individualism. But in the social world of national programs and propagandas we curse the individualism which dares to assert itself. We are a people fighting against ourselves. We have no unifying Christian philosophy which will sustain us or guide us. We are afraid and timid. We know not our own minds.

In such a state the present helplessness of the Christian Church is the most pitiable thing to be witnessed. There was a time when Christianity knew very well its own standard of concept and action. Such a time was the first century of Christianity. Christians then dared to oppose the State and the existing militaristic regime in the name of a pacifist Christ and a Sovereign God. Emperor nor King, public shame nor private death could deter them from their unrelenting stand. It was God before the State and allegiance to Christ before conformity. Alternatives? There were none! Before such uncompromising allegiance, rulers and generals found themselves helpless. The conscience of a courageous people won out.

Another such period was the Reformation. The instances are too numerous to mention. From Luther to Zwingli, from John Knox to Archbishop Cranmer, from John Wesley to the humblest individual, there was a holy observance of the meaning and worth of personal opinion as contrasted to the arbitrary coercion of secular authority. There was something, some higher authority, before which the knee could bow in reverent humility, and that something was not the governments of man and their dictatorial decrees.

However, power and possession crumble the highest of ideals. Once Protestantism united its forces to the will of the State, the independence of the Church was doomed. No longer would it be possible for a Christian to think as a Christian, but only as a servant of the State. His conscience from henceforth was to be conscripted in time of peace, his life sacrificed in time of war. The inalienable rights of the individual became forever afterward the inalienable rights of the State. The very ideals for which mankind had fought and died, became solidified into the transient and practical exigencies of the State. Religion, the religion of the masses, was forever afterward to be interpreted in terms of the jingoism of patriotism.

In vain one searches today for a clear and complete statement of the position of the church in a time of chaos. Isolated statements are so contradictory, so misleading, as to leave one absolutely bewildered. The church at one moment supports the machinery of war for the purposes of wiping out "that devil Hitler," and at the next, declares itself for a meaningless indifference which casts all moral concerns to the winds. Official statements are notable either for their brevity and vagueness or complete absence.

Is it then true that the Church faces the same hopeless situation it faced in the Great War—that of surrender? Once again, the Church is hedging, marking time, trying to keep a little face, desperately courting respectability, which is only the official voice of the status quo. Today, alas, the Church no longer recognizes its Master's voice. It wants to survive, and its concern in survival is so absorbing that it forgets the conditions of survival.

In the midst of this aimless, drifting, purposeless nothingness, is it small wonder that the minister is embarked on a chaotic sea without compass or chart? A young minister in Boston, fresh from theological school, and earnest in thought, at one moment declares himself against enrollment and the commonly accepted draft registration. But hardly has the printer's ink dried before his mind has experienced a radical change, and he is ready to register and accept the position of the multitude. One wonders just what went on behind the scenes to bring about such a sudden turn-about face. Is the Christian conscience so flexible that it can mean all things, without meaning anything?

It would seem almost heresy to say it, but there can only be one conclusion to the present aimless set-up—that the Christian Church is a *lost cause!!* There is neither unity nor a sense of direction. We are like the bewildered disciples who once cried in agony of spirit: "Lord, to whom shall we turn?" To whom, or to what, shall we turn, indeed?

These are days for ringing declarations and yet, where will they be heard? These are days when, if ever, the Church should be voicing the deepest social issues of the hour, but where are they being voiced? These

are days, when leadership is more crucially needed than in any great crisis of history, but where is the leadership so much needed?

It is undoubtedly too late for a lost cause to find itself. Probably nothing can save it. But if it were to find itself and if it could be saved, would it not be by some such means as the following:

First, a resolute and unified declaration on the part of all Christians stating in unequivocal terms their stand in relation to war and peace. This is the greatest single issue before mankind at the present moment. The results of this issue will unquestionably swing the future pendulum of human history up or down, forward or backward. Where does the Church really stand? Are the moral equations so involved that the Church cannot make up its mind? Is the background of the Master's life and thought so obscure that it can no longer guide or lead? Is this matter of being a Christian so interwoven with hypocritical difficulties that we must forever give up the attempt to be Christians? First, and foremost of all, where does the Church stand? If we could know that, we could at least head in some direction. But until we do discover where the Church stands, there is nothing by which to steer.

Secondly, having made up its mind, the Church should establish an active positive program of militant campaigning. It is senseless to deal in platitudes. Either there are things to be done in a constructive, statesmanlike manner, or there is just no sense talking about the whole thing. "Either fish, or cut bait," is an old slogan, but one which challenges the very moral fibre of the Church's life. Totalitarian nations plan their programs with an astute vigilance for the ends in view which simply amazes us. And they not only plan, but they execute their plans with such swiftness and technical accuracy that every one is caught off guard. In a moment of emergency, we outline vast panoramas of national defense programs which sweep us all along in a flurry of unthinking adherence. If such programs can be planned and carried out by thinking organizations on a secular plane, is it unwarranted presumption to ask of the Church a similar plan of militant action following the ideals of the Kingdom of God? Think and act! But with the Church it is of momentous importance that it think and act at once, before it is too late!

In the third place, if the lost cause is not too lost, it will capture the future possibilities of economic and social reorganization, before such reorganization is attempted by less skillful and more blundering hands. In other words, what has the Church to offer for the stabilizing of the world on an economic basis? The One, whose name it bears, thought on humanitarian scales which seem too great for our frail machinery. But it should be clear by now that procrastination and compromise are no longer possible. "He that is not for me is against me." We must attempt the heights, or forever yield the entire ground. The Christian concept of life—of life for every one in equal measure—must be accepted. Only thus, can the future be secured.

Perhaps this is too much to ask of a cause which seems to be lost. And yet, has there ever been a resurgence of life which has not eventuated in new reformations when the imagination has been fired with purpose and idealism? Too much fatalism pervades our Christian Churches—too much surrender. And it is always the army that turns its back which is slaughtered wholesale, and thus becomes a lost cause. To fight, one must keep his face ever toward the enemy, and forge onward, though it mean certain death. There is only one means by which the Church can become not the lost cause, but *The Cause Triumphant,* and that is by fighting, with weapons of the spirit, for the life of mankind. The hour has struck for such a fight! And the hour—is late!!

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

XXVIII

A Chicago dispatch from the Associated Press reports the following:

Howard Schomer, assistant dean of the Rockefeller Memorial Chapel at the University of Chicago, was arrested today on a charge of violating the Selective Service Act.

Officials reported that he had declined to sign his card on registration day, October 16, but had submitted, instead, an affidavit of "conscientious objection."

Mr. Schomer, who listed himself as a graduate of Harvard University, was brought before United States Commissioner E. K. Walker, and pleaded innocent.

Before he was taken into custody Mr. Schomer, who is 25 years old, issued a statement in which he said:

"First, I am one of those Christians who take very seriously what they understand to be Jesus' teachings about violence.

"Second, I am a licensed Congregational minister, belonging to a religious body which cannot accept the distinction between layman and clergyman made by the Selective Service Act.

"Third, I am an American citizen who believes in its application to such cases as mine that the Selective Service Act violates the Constitution of the United States.

"I am told that business men in business controversies have thought it wise or necessary to take positions comparable to mine for the purpose of testing their rights and the rights of similar persons under the Constitution."

An Associated Press dispatch from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, reports the following:

The Reverend Allen Clay Lambert, who refused to register for military service and declared from the pulpit that conscription was the "greatest crime against the republic since its founding," was charged today with draft evasion. George Mashank, acting United States Attorney, said the 34-year-old United Lutheran pastor in the Central Pennsylvania community of Sinking Valley will be required to post bond for a hearing before a United States Commissioner.

The New York *Times* reports the following:

A young father, part-time janitor in the Labor Temple here, stood his ground yesterday while Federal Judge Vincent L. Leibell tried for half an hour to persuade him to register under the draft law.

"My God had told me in prayer that I cannot register," the young man declared.

Giving up his efforts to get the young man to register,

Judge Leibell finally sentenced him to eighteen months in prison. The term was six months longer than that imposed on the divinity students.

Patiently, Judge Leibell had exhorted Mongiore to think of his duties to his wife, his 3-month-old child and to the nation. The wife, Mrs. Ora Mongiore, stood up suddenly in the court room and asked permission to make a statement. Judge Leibell called her forward, and, tall, slim and rather poorly dressed, she stood before the bench and said:

"I would be ashamed of my husband if he did not stand up for his convictions."

Mongiore said he had "great respect for the soldiers who fight at the front," but explained that he was fighting "with the power of love."

"I'm afraid that's not bullet-proof," said Judge Leibell. "You'd better present your ideas to the men who seem to be partitioning the world, and get them to lay down their arms first."

Later: After four days in jail, Mongiore registered, and was released from prison.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation reports that, on November 14th last, the Fellowship of Reconciliation offices in London, England, were completely wrecked by a falling bomb. A cable from London states that "our people escaped injury."

The United Press sends the following dispatch from London, England:

Thomas E. Naylor, Labor member of Parliament, said today he was seeking a forty-eight hour world-wide Christmas Armistice.

Naylor announced he would ask Prime Minister Winston Churchill in the House of Commons "If he will invoke the good offices of the Vatican or some neutral state in furthering a proposal that will enable the peoples of all countries to commemorate the Christmas anniversary under more appropriate conditions than otherwise is possible."

The Associated Press publishes the following news item from London, England:

W. S. Seamark, Northampton butcher who described himself as a "Christian Pacifist—Stop the War candidate" announced his candidacy today for the Parliament.

Peace News (London) publishes a statement adopted by the Quarterly Meeting of Friends in Lancashire and Cheshire:

We believe in the possibility of peace now, without surrender, without defeat or dishonour, the necessary condition being that the vain pursuit of victory should be relinquished. The present moment is opportune, when neither side in this conflict is in a position to dictate terms.

We believe it possible and right to seek now to reëstablish contacts with the Axis Powers. The United States and other Powers friendly to this country have combined to maintain relations with the German and Italian Governments which involve a measure of mutual trust. The outcome of the American Presidential election might well provide the opportunity for that country to make yet another effort to bring peace to the stricken world.

An Associated Press dispatch from Portage, Wisconsin, reports the following:

A small army of conscientious objectors, trained in the arts of mercy rather than the science of war, stands drilled and ready to serve the nation in one of the most dangerous of wartime tasks—noncombatant medical and stretcher service duty. The men are members of the Seventh Day Adventist Medical Cadet Corps.

Wearing blue-green uniforms and carrying stretchers instead of rifles, Wisconsin members have completed an arduous eighteen-day training course on the frozen hills and wooded slopes of a practice "battlefield" near here. Forty-three strong, they received their training under Major Everett Dick, former history teacher of Lincoln, Nebraska, who founded the Medical Cadet Corps movement seven years ago.

Only a handful of the Adventists were trained before the shadow of the European war fell across America. Then Major Dick's plan was taken up by his church and he was made organizer and fulltime commander of the cadets. His plan was approved by the Surgeon General of the United States Army.

In the event their draft numbers are called the cadets will present certificates at Army reception centers indicating their proficiency and experience, and the tacit agreement between the Army and their church, it is said, is that they will be assigned to medical units.

The forty-three, from all parts of Wisconsin and including ministers, were given a foretaste of the dangerous jobs they have chosen on a simulated battle ground. The instruction also included eighteen hours of stretcher drill, twenty-five hours of close-order army drill, eight hours of splinting and basic and advanced Red Cross first aid courses.

The Christ-Spirit

I am in the world.
I am always in the world.
I am seeking to find my way into human hearts.
I am the Christ-Spirit.

Before all things I was and without me there is no reality of being.
I belong not to one man only, but to all men;
Not to one age only, but to all ages.
I am the same yesterday, today, and forever.

I am the Light of the World.
I am the way, the truth and the life.
I am come to reveal to you the divine completeness of life,
Its limitless beauty and power.

All that I am, through me mankind is to become.
I am the fulfilment of every unselfish desire of the human heart.

For this purpose am I manifested:
That ye may have a greater abundance of life.

I, the Christ-Spirit, will destroy the works of evil.
I will lead captivity captive and will give freedom to man.
I am the infinite and eternal wisdom.
I am within you the power of God unto salvation.
I, and I alone, can bring peace, justice and fellowship into the world.
Truly I am the Prince of Peace.

I shall redeem mankind not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit.
I am Divine Love seeking always to find my way into your hearts
That ye may be made one in love.
THAT YE MAY BE MADE ONE IN LOVE.

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

Correspondence

Two Letters from Dr. Pinkham

I

Loyalty to God

Editor of UNITY:

President Coffin, of the Union Theological Seminary, expresses sadness of heart because eight students, of admirable Christian character and devotion, "have persisted in their defiance of the law." That is one way of stating the case. Another way would be to avow heartfelt rejoicing because these young men have persisted in their loyalty to the right as God has given them to see the right. I confidently predict that time will come when the Union Seminary will record with pride the steadfastness of these students in protesting in the most effective way possible against the whole idiotic war system. (I will not call war wicked, for that would be to flatter it, as a fool is flattered when called a knave.)

President Coffin says that any government has a right to ask for registration. Does it make no difference what the registration is for? It may be said that any government has the right to collect taxes. But Thoreau refused to pay when the government was waging war, and chose rather to go to jail. I do not think Thoreau's reputation has suffered in consequence. A wide reading of his essay on "The Duty of Civil Disobedience" would be profitable at the present time.

The conscription act prescribes a penalty for those who "evade" registration. We should assume that the word was carefully selected. It connotes a degree of deceit. It points to slackers, draft dodgers. Not such were the Union Theological Seminary students. They went before the registrars, fully identified themselves, giving their names, and all pertinent information. Thus their formal refusal to register was itself a virtual registration, should have been so regarded, and would have been had the federal officials been wiser. Now these officials have brought discredit upon the conscription act. A law which jails even a few such choice youths is wrong.

I venture to hope, and even to foretell, that President Roosevelt will pardon the eight students at an early date, without waiting till petitions therefor have multiplied.

HENRY W. PINKHAM.

Newton Centre, Massachusetts.

II

Pardon for the Union Theological Students

Editor of UNITY:

I am circulating the enclosed petition to President Roosevelt. One such, bearing sundry signatures, has been sent to him, and others are on the way. I think it explains and also justifies itself. I hope you will deem it of sufficient interest and importance to deserve publication and perhaps editorial comment.

I have no acquaintance with the eight Union Theological Seminary students. They have no connection with, nor knowledge of, the undertaking to send petitions to the President for their release. It may well be that they would prefer jail to freedom for a period equal to that in which other young men, who do not happen to be ministers or theological students, must be instructed in the wholesale killing of fellow human beings. A year in jail will not hurt them. But it will hurt, or at any rate it ought to hurt, every citizen who loves his country and mourns to see it blindly and stupidly punishing young men for being true to themselves and to God.

It should be added that personal letters to the President will be much more potent than signatures to a petition. Let the President hear from the people.

HENRY W. PINKHAM.

Newton Centre, Massachusetts.

[A Petition]

To President Franklin D. Roosevelt:

Sir:

We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States, hereby earnestly petition you for the immediate pardon of the eight Union Seminary students lately sentenced to prison for a year and a day for their refusal to register under the conscription act.

We respectfully submit:

1. The penalty prescribed in the act is for those who "evade" registration. The word connotes a degree of deceit. It points to slackers, to draft dodgers. Not such were the Union students. They went before the registrars, fully identified themselves, giving their names and all pertinent information required. Thus their formal refusal to register was in fact a virtual registration. It should have been so regarded, and would have been if the federal officials had been wiser. A merely formal dereliction, inspired too by noble motives, deserved a merely nominal punishment. Instead of "a year and a day," a day would have been appropriate.

2. These theological students were by the act exempted from military training, whether conscientious objectors to war or not. Accordingly a refusal of the one thing required of them, namely, registration, was their only way of protesting effectively, as young men of military age, against a law compelling other young men to spend a year in learning the art of collective homicide.

3. To the eight Union students the whole country is indebted for a heartening exhibition of independence, courage, and firmness in the right as God has given them to see the right. Shall such qualities be penalized by the government of the United States? We say, No. God forbid! It is your high privilege to correct the mistake of the federal judge, and we confidently appeal to you to pardon these admirable young men at once.

National Unity

Editor of UNITY:

The most discouraging thing about the late election is the all but universal assertion: "Now that it is over, let all bitterness die, all criticism cease, as a united people let us stand back of our President."

The Editor of UNITY far better than any correspondent will handle the question of the duty of patriotic citizens in these confusing days; however, at times, there are advantages in clouds of witnesses.

Of course all loyal Americans must stand near the President, otherwise their voices cannot be heard, so great is the clamor of war and the shouts of triumph. If ever in the history of our country, intelligent guardians of liberty were needed in places where their voices can be heard, it is now.

Hitlerism did not begin in our day. Since Cain killed his brother it has been a menace. It did no good to drown all but Noah and his family. The germ of Hitlerism evidently got in the Ark in some of the beasts. Noah was infected when he was drunk, and he was not drunk with love of power, just plain gutter drunkenness. While still only half sober he cursed one of his sons and all of his descendants, and sowed the seeds of discord among the seeds of Noah.

Some of the germs came to this country on the *Arabella* along with the charter of the Massachusetts Bay Company. Most of those in authority were soon so puffed up with self-admiration, so loved their theocratic dictatorship that they decided freedom of conscience was not good for anyone but themselves. Even Hitler might get a few pointers in persecution from the way they treated witches and Quakers.

President Roosevelt appears to have so many colonial ancestors. Some might have been of the dictatorial kind, as well as some who suffered much for freedom of conscience. Inheritance is queer, no telling when and where good and bad traits will break out. Generations of ease and wealth tend to make rich the soil for love of dictatorial power and inflated egotism.

Loving and admiring as he must his colonial ancestors who suffered much for freedom, knowing how easy it is in time of war hysteria for freedom to be lost while persecutors flourish, President Roosevelt should be the first to urge and welcome intelligent far-seeing loyal citizens to stand guard, to warn him of danger, to safeguard freedom, individual rights, freedom of speech and conscience, to see the loss of all hope for the democratic way of life if he allows us to get into this World War, and to help him keep the peace.

O. C. S.

Miami, Florida.

A Letter From London

Editor of UNITY:

What we in London experience is not a war; it is the blind and wilful destruction of homes, hospitals, churches, and culture. The war that Hitler is waging on men's nerves gets worse and worse as the nights get longer and colder. At six o'clock the day is finished; then we prepare our evening meal, the blackout, and the shelter for the night. I have no especial shelter in my house, but the people who live here with me, including my brother who comes to sleep here, go to an empty

room in the basement, where I have put mattresses on the floor, and where each brings down his or her own bedding. An oil stove provides a little warmth for some hours, and by the light of a candle we lie down and talk until one after another drops off to sleep, in spite of bombs and gunfire. The room where we were in the beginning has had all its windows blown out by a bomb which was dropped in the street. Now we are praying that this room may be spared, for naturally there are not workers enough to replace all the broken windows. My evening prayer is either to be spared or to be killed immediately, for I would not become a cripple nor an invalid.

The English people are marvelous. With tenacity and perseverance, they face all these hardships in spite of bombs and shattered premises everywhere. Business goes on as usual. People buy and sell, are cheerful and hopeful, and are quite putting up with their fate. The only difference is that nearly everybody stays at home or in some shelter after dark. Shops and offices close early, so that the staff can get home in time.

M. H.

London, England.

No Room

Don't come, little Jesus—not this year.
There's too much worry, too much fear.
Smoldering rafters litter the ground,
And there's not enough milk to go around.

Egypt's a long way over the sea;
No ship will sail for a refugee,
And visas are terribly hard to get.
Not this year, Jesus—not just yet.

Women once more must wail and cry
Because their stricken little ones die.
With an extra child what indeed could we do?
Turn away, little Jesus; we don't want you.

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 114)

gives up his opposition." But the pastor refuses to betray his God to Hitler, refuses to preach the new heathenism.

At the outbreak of the war a chance of freedom was offered to Niemoeller. As a former U-boat officer he was asked to volunteer for participation in the war. Hitler had at that time given orders that upon acceptance of these terms Niemoeller should be released. But to the tempters the pastor replied icily: "I have been in the war for years. I am a soldier of God, but no soldier of Hitler's."

Especially hard for him has been the separation from his children. His oldest son, Hans Jochen, always greets him demonstratively at visiting times with "God bless you, father!" and stoutly refuses to say "Heil Hitler." When an SA man, one of the camp guards, once asked him if he knew why his father was imprisoned, the youngster replied confidently, "Yes, certainly I know why. It is because he has proclaimed the gospel clearly and purely." And his little sister pronounced a sentence, now famous, at which her mother scarcely knew whether to laugh or cry: "When I write the address, 'Concentration Camp, Sachsenhausen,' then I am always very proud."

Else Niemoeller, the brave wife of the pastor, has had to carry on under incredible suffering, searching of the house, arrests, police supervision, and once the exploding of a bomb in the house. Before nothing does she despair. She shares the fate of her husband for better or for worse, and is proud that he is the last man in Germany who dares to offer open resistance to Hitler. A few months ago she received from her husband the following letter which once and for all dispels the illusion that Niemoeller will ever submit to the Nazis:

March, 1940.

Everywhere during these months the ship of our Church is again afloat. The banner is tattered, the masts are broken, but the Lord Christ is still at the helm and the ship floats. Who would have believed this at the time that Ludwig Mueller (Reichbishop and Hitler's dictator of churches) thought he had caught a good prize? And I believe that my imprisonment is also part of the will of God. First the derisive laughter—that we have now—and then come the full churches and praying households. Therefore to be bitter would be the most vile ingratitude.

Today Niemoeller is sick. His strength has been seriously undermined, and he suffers from a stomach ailment. Camp attendants behave toward him with correctness, but also with strictness, and he is not permitted to go to a sanatorium. He has not been beaten, but he has told his wife of watching others being beaten up. He asked permission of the authorities to bury the dead in the camp, but this was sternly refused.

Martin Niemoeller still carries on the Christian war from his concentration camp. He is Hitler's prisoner, but who in the end will be victorious, National Socialism or the gospel—the future will show. *Nofrontier News Service.*

Nazi Flag Lowered

Stockholm, November 21.—A story of how King Christian X of Denmark laid down the law to a Nazi officer in an argument over display of the Nazi flag in the occupied country has caused considerable interest here.

The story, cited today by the Swedish newspaper, *Goteborgs Handels-och Sjofartstidning,* as characteristic of the growing anti-Nazi feeling in the occupied country, follows:

The King noticed a Nazi flag flying over an official building recently. He remarked to a German officer that this was contrary to the treaty between Denmark and Germany.

The officer replied the flag was flown according to instructions from Berlin.

"The flag must be removed before 12 o'clock, otherwise I will send a soldier to do it," the monarch declared.

At five minutes to twelve the flag was still flying.

The King said he was about to send a soldier to take it down.

"The soldier will be shot," the Nazi officer replied.

"I am the soldier," the King said calmly.

The Nazi flag was lowered.

—New York *Herald Tribune.*

AS A CHRISTMAS GIFT—

Send UNITY to a new reader. Trial subscription of

6 MONTHS for $1.00 *A Journal of Liberal Opinion*

UNITY
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago

For the enclosed dollar, send UNITY as a Christmas gift, for a trial period of six months to

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... State .....